Rev. Wm Ingraham Kip

CHURCH RECORD.

A Weekly Paper, devoted chiefly to the cause of Christianity and Education.

VOL. I. FLUSHING, N. Y., FEBRUARY 6, 1841. NO. 11.

THE CHURCH RECORD.

FRANCIS L. HAWKS, D. D.,
PROPRIETOR AND EDITOR.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING, BY CHARLES R. LINCOLN, FLUSHING, N. Y.

TERMS—Three Dollars per annum, in advance.

Historical.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 80.]

II. *Of applicants who have not obtained a diploma from any College, but who have pursued their studies in some approved literary institution.*

The applicant of this class has first to procure a certificate which will serve him instead of a diploma. This is to be obtained from the instructor or instructors of the institution in which he has studied, and may be as follows:—

"The undersigned does hereby certify that A. B. has been a student in that the studies which he has there pursued have been the following, viz:

and that he has made satisfactory improvements in them. Given under my hand this day of A. D. ."

With this certificate to be used instead of a diploma let the applicant pursue the directions already given to the first class of candidates.

—

III. *Of applicants who have not a diploma or certificate from any approved literary institution, but have studied privately.*

The first step to be taken by this candidate, as by every other, is to make known his intention to the bishop, and at the time of doing so, he should also communicate to him that he has studied privately, and has neither diploma nor certificate, from any approved literary institution. The bishop will then appoint two presbyters of the Church to examine the applicant. Having performed that duty, if they are satisfied, they will furnish him with a certificate as follows:

"The undersigned, appointed by the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese of to examine A. B. who desires to become a candidate for holy orders in said diocese, having performed the duty, do hereby certify that he possesses 'such academical learning as may enable him to enter advantageously on a course of theology.' Given under our hand this day of A. D. ."

With this certificate in place of a diploma, let him pursue the course prescribed for applicants of the first class.

—

IV. *Of applicants who having no knowledge of the learned languages, etc., seek admission by dispensation.*

I. The applicant of this class must be at least twenty-seven years old.

II. He must inform the bishop of his desire to be a candidate, and when he makes known his intention to the bishop, he may apply for a dispensation as to the Hebrew: and the *bishop alone* may at his "sole discretion," and without reference to the age of the candidate, and without the advice and consent of the Standing Committee, grant such dispensation. Such, however, is not the case with reference to a dispensation as to "Latin, Greek, and other branches of learning not strictly ecclesiastical:" here the interposition of the Standing Committee is indispensable.

III. The applicant should therefore, when he makes known his intention to the bishop, ask also for his assent to a dispensation as to Latin, Greek, and other branches of learning: and the bishop, if he sees fit, may grant it, to be deemed effectual, provided "a majority of the members of the Standing Commitee" consent thereto. The applicant has therefore next to obtain such consent from a majority of the members of the Committee, and to do this, he must obtain from two respectable presbyters of the Church, a certificate as follows, viz:—

"The undersigned, presbyters of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, do hereby state, that in their opinion A. B., who desires admission as a candidate for holy orders, with a dispensation as to 'the knowledge of the Latin, Greek and Hebrew languages, and other branches of learning not strictly ecclesiastical,' 'possesses extraordinary strength of natural understanding, a peculiar aptitude to teach, and a large share of prudence.' Given under our hands, this day of A. D. ."

With this certificate and a certificate that his intention has been made known to the bishop, the applicant presents himself to the Standing Committee, and a majority of the members thereof, may, (if they see fit,) then give their consent to his admission as a candidate with the dispensation. The evidence of such consent on their parts, is furnished in their signatures to the testimonial, set forth already under the directions to the first class of applicants; for with such a testimonial every applicant, no matter to what class he belongs, must be furnished before he can be recorded by the bishop as a candidate.

IV. The applicant must also produce to the Standing Committee, if he be not personally known to them, precisely the same certificate prescribed for applicants of the first class as to his piety, attachment to the church, etc. etc. Without this he will not obtain a testimonial recommending him, even if the members of the Committee should deem his a suitable case for a dispensation.

V. In no case can an applicant of this class be ordained before he is thirty years old.

There is also another class of applicants for admission to orders, whose case is not provided for in this canon. It consists "of those who have officiated as ministers among other denominations of Christians," and such applicants will fall under one or other of the classes already enumerated. The particular course to be pursued by them, however, is specially provided for by law, and may be found particularly set forth under the XXI canon of this volume.

—

One of the most important inquiries which arises under this canon is as to the rights and powers of the Standing Committee, and we therefore proceed to a consideration of that subject.

That the bishop has not the sole power of dispensation granted to him except as to a knowledge of the Hebrew language, is very plain; but what part is the Standing Committee to act? Does it owe so much deference to the bishop's opinions that, almost as a matter of course, it is to assent to the bishop's wishes in dispensing either with time or qualifications? That the opinions of the bishop should be listened to with great respect, and that they should not be thwarted without good cause, will be readily conceded by every churchman impressed with a proper sense of the office of a bishop: but that the Standing Committee in matters of dispensation, is called on to exercise a perfectly independent judgment, and possesses equal and concurrent powers in the case with the bishop, would seem to follow from a proper interpretation of the canon.

In the particular of dispensation it is not a *council of advice* at all, and was not meant to be so. It will be remembered that the first introduction of Standing Committees in 1789, was that they might judge of the fitness of persons seeking holy orders; and until 1808 they never were made a council of advice; their duties were confined to granting testimonials. In the discharge of this duty they acted according to their convictions of conscience, without any intervention of the bishop, and so complete was their control over the subject of admission to the ministry, that no bishop was allowed to ordain save on their testimonial, which they might give or withhold at pleasure. Bearing this in mind as the governing motive which led to the creation of Standing Committees, an attentive examination of all the subsequent legislation on the subject, up to the present day, will show that this fact has never been lost sight of; and in the canon now before us, it is demonstrably clear from its language, that the idea of considering the Committee as an advisory, and not as a controlling body,

in the matter of dispensations, was studiously negatived. For it is remarkable that the words of this canon differ from those of the canon of 1820, relating to dispensations as to learning, and from those of 1826, touching dispensations as to time, and the change is not accidental.

Under the canon of 1820, touching the matter of learning, the bishop was not required expressly to have either the advice or the consent of the Standing Committee. The necessity of such consent is to be gathered by inference only, from the fact that the Standing Committees are restricted in granting their testimonial by certain conditions in that particular case. But the bishop is not expressly required *to ask for their consent.*

In the canon of 1826, respecting time, the language used is, "unless the bishop, with the *advice* and consent of the clerical members of the Standing Committee, shall deem it expedient to ordain the candidate."

But in the canon before us, the word *advice* is studiously omitted, because advice was not what the canon meant to require. In the 4th section relative to learning, the language is, "and the bishop *with the consent* of a majority of the members of the Standing Committee," etc.: and in the seventh section as to time, the phraseology is, "unless the bishop, *with the consent* of the members of the Standing Committee," etc. They come not in then as advisers; they are invested with equal and coördinate powers in granting a dispensation. They cannot indeed force the bishop to ordain any one to whom they grant testimonials; for his conscience may forbid him to do so; neither can the bishop ordain any one from whom they see fit to withhold a testimonial, because they may not be able with a good conscience to concur in the bishop's view of the merits of an applicant, and he cannot directly or indirectly force them to do so.

The purpose of the canon as it now stands, appears to be, so far as it relates to applicants, to subject them to an additional and distinct ordeal in the Standing Committee; and, so far as the bishop is concerned, to shield him as much as possible, not by a removal, but by a division of responsibility, from that censure and ill will, which his rejection of a candidate is so well calculated to produce. It is an advantage to the Church that candidates should be subjected to an additional scrutiny which can do no harm to the deserving, while it detects the unworthy or unfit; and it is an advantage to the bishop to have an answer to the complaints of the disappointed, in the fact, that in his performance of the solemn duty of determining on the admission of an individual to the sacred office, the Church has kindly and properly interposed a chosen body of men to share with him the weighty responsibility: and that interpretation of the canon is correct which keeps in view both these advantages, for they meet the practical evils which it was the design of the law to remedy.

To secure, as far as possible, the independent expression of opinion, both on the part of the bishop, and of the Standing Committee, it would be well, if, in all cases, the opinion of each party could be given without a knowleege of that of the other; for to some extent each must be affected by an acquaintance with the views of the other. There is commonly a mutual respect which makes it impossible it should be otherwise. In point of time, the Bishop, by law, must be first applied to, and with him it rests to *form* the first opinion on the propriety of granting the application. He is not, however, bound to communicate it to the Standing Committee, and it would seem to be premature to make it known until the *consent* of the Committee to the request of the applicant, is certified to him. This course seems to be best, because *it upholds the Episcopal dignity.* Instead of presenting himself before the Committee, with a request that they would consent to the exercise of one of his highest official acts, in the reception or ordination of a candidate, the Bishop assumes the more dignified attitude of the highest ecclesiastical officer, determining (after all preliminary acts prescribed by the Church are complied with) whether *he,* in the conscientious exercise of a high and solemn responsibility, which he owes to the whole Church, will, or will not, perform an act which he only can perform, and which, according as it is wisely or unwisely done, must affect the Church with lasting consequences for good or for evil. He thus becomes the final arbiter: his is, as it should be, the last ordeal to be passed. The Committee must withhold consent or give it. If they do the former, the bishop has no responsibility to meet, and can be the subject of no complaint: if they do the latter, and the bishop still cannot approve of the applicant, (a circumstance which rarely happens,) the case is one calling on him firmly to meet that responsibility of official station, from which no legislation either could or should entirely exempt him. It is *needless* responsibility alone, from which the law seeks to excuse him.

The respectability of the Church is so intimately identified with that of the ministry, that we cannot here too sedulously guard against any looseness of interpretation, which would tend to relax a tittle of that rigid scrutiny, to which applicants for holy orders are wisely subjected. Whenever the Church has lost the respect of that world for whose benefit God instituted it, the records of all past ecclesiastical history, will show that the cause has been in the ignorance or the wickedness of the clergy.

In taking leave of this subject, it only remains to refer the student to Canon xiii. on a future page, as being intimately connected with the topic we have here been discussing, and as affording, in the history of the legislation there set forth, evidence confirmatory of the view we have taken of the distinct, independent exercise of the dispensing power by a Standing Committee, without reference to the bishop's opinion in the case. In that history will be found the conclusive fact, that after the sole power of dispensation had for a time been confided to the bishop, it was taken away upon the express ground that there was *danger of abuse*: and was then divided between the bishop and Standing Committee. This surely could not have been done with the intention or expectation that the Committee was to do no more than give a responsive echo to the bishop's opinion or wishes.

One other canon relating to candidates for orders remains to be noticed. It is Canon VI. of 1838.

1838. No person who is a candidate for holy orders in this Church shall be permitted to accept from any diocesan convention an appointment as a lay deputy to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the General Convention.

—

CANON X.

OF THE CONDUCT REQUIRED IN CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS

The first canon on this subject was made in 1808, and is as follows:

1808. The Bishop, or other ecclesiastical authority who may have the superintendence of candidates for orders, shall take care that they do not indulge in any vain or trifling conduct, or in any amusements most liable to be abused to licentiousness, or unfavorable to that seriousness, and to those pious and studious habits, which become those who are preparing for the holy ministry.

This continued to be the law until the general revision of the Canons in 1832, when the following was adopted:

1832. The Bishop, or other ecclesiastical authority, who may have the superintendence of candidates for orders, shall take care that they pursue their studies diligently and under proper direction, and that they do not indulge in any vain or trifling conduct, or in any amusements most liable to be abused to licentiousness, or unfavorable to that seriousness, and to those pious and studious habits, which become those who are preparing for the Holy Ministry.

The only change, it will be observed, consists in declaring that the bishop shall take care that candidates "pursue their studies diligently and under proper direction." In the former canon nothing was said on the subject, for clergymen were then much needed, and facilities for advantageous study were not to be found — but in 1832, though an increase of clergymen was very desirable, it was not so difficult to find opportunities of studying to advantage. Theological seminaries had been established, and provision had been made for the support of students in them. The number of parochial clergymen under whom candidates might study, probably had much increased. In point of fact, most of the candidates for orders in the Church, are at this day, prepared in the seminaries.

—

CANON XI.

OF CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS WHO ARE LAY READERS.

1804. No candidate for Holy Orders shall take upon him to perform devotional service in any church, but by the permission of the Bishop or ecclesiastical authority of the state in which said candidate may wish to perform such service. And it shall be the duty of the bishop or ecclesiastical authority to limit and confine every such candidate to such part or parts of the Common Prayer Book, to such dress, and to such stations in the church, as are appropriate only to lay readers: and also to point out what sermons or homilies he shall or may read to his congregation. And a non-conformity on the part of the candidate to such restrictions, shall be deemed in all cases a disqualification for Holy Orders.

Lay reading seems to have been practised in the American Episcopal Church from an early period of its history. In our colonial state, we find it to have been the custom in some places, adopted

from necessity, and in every instance, so far as our researches have gone, without any express permission to the reader from our then diocesan, the Bishop of London. — To more than one of the prelates of that see, the practice appears however, to have been known, and we are not aware that it was in any instance forbidden or discountenanced. Probably, the bishops thought that in the necessities of the country, it was best silently to permit it until they knew it to be abused : and they naturally concluded that such abuse would promptly be complained of by the adjacent clergy, whenever it should show itself.

If necessity called for it before the American resolution, after this event, its necessity was by no means diminished, and hence the usage was continued, lay readtng was practised by many pious members of the church, who were not candidates for orders ; and no license was sought from the hishop to enable them to do so. Whether abuses followed the practice we are unable to say ; but it was so obviously liable to serious abuse that the present canon was passed. It confined itself to *candidates for orders*, because, probably in 1804, most of the lay readers were candidates, and a complete check was kept upon them by the very severe penalty of a total disqualification for orders which followed upon their departure from the Bishop's directions.

Thus the law continued until the canon of 1808 was passed.

1808. No candidate for holy orders shall take upon himself to perform the service of the church, but by the license of the Bishop or ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese or State in which such candidate may wish to perform the service. And such candidate shall submit to all the regulations which the Bishop or ecclesiastical authority may prescribe; he shall not use the Absolution nor Benediction ; he shall not use the dress nor the stations which are appropriate to Clergymen ministering in the congregation; and shall officiate from the desk only; he shall conform to the directions of the Bishop or ecclesiastical authority, as to the sermons or homilies to be read ; nor shall any Lay Reader deliver sermons of his own composition, nor, except in cases of extrordinary emergency, or very peculiar expediency, perform any part of the service, when a Clergyman is present in the congregation.

A non-conformity to this Canon shall be deemed in all cases a disqualification for holy orders.

This law, instead of leaving it, as the former had done, to the discretion of each bishop, to impose such restrictions as to him seemed best, imposed itself the restriction, in certain particulars. The object of this was uniformity ; and was produced by the following case.

An individual who had been an Unitarian minister was desirous of being ordained in the Church, and while a candidate, officiated in the surplice and gown, at the suggestion of a member of the Standing Committee who was desirous of being guided in the matter of signing the candidates testimonials by the ability he might exhibit in the performance of public ministerial duty.

The next canon on the subject, and that which is now in force was passed in

1822. No candidate for Holy Orders shall take upon himself to perform the service of the Church, but by a license from the Bishop, or, if there be no Bishop, the Clerical Members of the Standing Committee of the Diocese in which such candidate may wish to perform the service. And such candidate shall submit to all the regulations which the Bishop or said Clerical Members may prescribe; he shall not use the absolution or benediction; he shall not assume the dress appropriate to Clergymen ministering in the congregation ; and shall officiate from the desk only ; he shall conform to the directions of the Bishop or said Clerical members, as to the sermons or homilies to be read ; nor shall any Lay Reader deliver sermons of his own composition ; nor, except in cases of extraordinary emergency, or very peculiar expediency, perform any part of the service, when a Clergyman is present in the congregation.

This canon very mercifully and properly removed the penalty, so disproportionate to the offence, of a total disqualification for orders. There was no necessity for it. Contumacious disobedience to his bishop on the part of a lay reader was an offence, for which the bishop might, without any canon on the subject, feel himself fully justified in refusing orders, until satisfaction was made by the offender : but by a positive enactment to shut the door forever against even a penitent offender ; to deny to the bishop who was the best judge in the case, the exercise of any discretion on the subject, was only to defeat the enactment by its own severity. To leave each case to be judged of on its own circumstances was the wiser course : for penalties unduly severe only tempt authority to overlook the offence, because when once proved it dare not dispense with the punishment.

Under this canon it admits of question whether any one can be a lay reader but a candidate for orders.

CANON XII.

OF CANDIDATES WHO MAY BE REFUSED ORDERS.

It was in 1804 that the first law was made on this subject, as follows :

1804. No bishop shall ordain any candidate, until he has inquired of him whether he has ever directly or indirectly applied for orders in any other diocese or state ; and if the bishop has reason to believe that the candidate has been refused orders in any other diocese or state, he shall write to the bishop of the diocese, or if there be no bishop, to the Standing Committee, to know whether any just cause exists why the candidate should not be ordained. When any bishop rejects the application of any candidate for orders, he shall immediately give notice to the bishop of every state or diocese, or, when there is no bishop, to the Standing Committee.

This canon was occasioned by the memorable case of the Rev. Ammi Rogers. The facts were that Rogers, who lived in Connecticut, was desirous of being admitted to holy orders, and some of the clergy there, interested themselves to procure his ordination. Bishop Seabury entertaining an unfavorable opinion of the man, declared that he never would ordain him, and Rogers therefore never made any formal application to him, and of course never was a candidate for orders in Connecticut. Removing afterward into the Western part of the diocese of New York, Rogers applied to Bishop Provoost for orders. Some of the New York clergy had heard that in Connecticut, he had been rejected upon a similar application, and of course they opposed his admission in New York. Upon this, Rogers repaired to Connecticut to obtain from the Secretary of the Convention there, a certificate that the records of Convention did not show any such fact. The Secretary of the Connecticut Convention was not at home, and Rogers fabricated a certificate in his name, on the strength of which, opposition was withdrawn, and he was ordained by the bishop of New York. In a few years after his ordination, he returned to Connecticut—the bishop and clergy refused to know him as belonging to that diocese, and by mutual consent the question, to which diocese he belonged, was referred to the House of Bishops.* As we have had occasion in another part of our volume to consider more particularly this case of Rogers, it is here necessary to say no more than that this reference to the House of Bishops suggested to the General Convention the necessity for the canon which we have just laid before the reader.

At the revision of the canons in 1808, this canon was incorporated without any alteration.

1808. In the words of the canon of 1804.

Thus it remained until 1832.

1832. No bishop shall ordain any candidate until he has inquired of him whether he has ever, directly or indirectly, applied for orders in any other Diocese; and if the Bishop has reason to believe that the candidate has been refused orders in any other Diocese, he shall write to the Bishop of the Diocese, or, if there be no Bishop, to the Standing Committee, to know whether any just cause exists why the candidate should not be ordained. When any Bishop rejects the application of any candidate for orders, he shall immediately give notice to the Bishop of every Diocese, or, where there is no Bishop, to the Standing Committee.

Under the canon of 1808, from which it will be perceived that of 1832 differs not in substance, a question of some importance has arisen, the decision of which, as it turns upon a general principle, and not upon a point of verbal construction, may very properly be placed at the close of all the canons on the subject of candidates who have been refused orders. The question alluded to is, how far the refusal of a candidate by a bishop in one diocese, is to be held conclusive by his brother

* Bp. White's Memoirs, p. 188.

bishop of another diocese? It arose in the case of the present rector of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia. The facts were these:—he left the practice of the medical profession to become a candidate for orders in the diocese of New-York, and was duly received, by Bishop Hobart as a candidate in 1822. Afteward, Bishop Hobart thought it to be his duty to decline ordaining him. Of the reasons which led the bishop to pursue this course, it is not necessary for our purpose now to speak; though the refusal was not on grounds affecting his moral or religious character. But the writer cannot in justice to both the gentlemen concerned, leave this point without bearing his testimony as a witness to a fact coming within his own knowledge. That fact is this, that some years afterward, an explanation took place, and an amicable understanding was established between the Bishop and the rector, which continued without interruption until the death of the former; and the bishop in a conversation on the subject, informed the present writer of the explanation which had taken place; avowed his satisfaction, and expressed his confidence in him. Having said this, we return to our statement of facts. Upon the refusal of Bishop Hobart to ordain him, he applied to the Standing Committee of Rhode Island, to be received as a candidate. Bishop Griswold, to whose jurisdiction that diocese belonged, wrote to Bishop Hobart informing him of the application, and requesting from him a statement of the objections against the applicant's, receiving orders: before this, however, Bishop Hobart had given to his brother prelates official notification of his refusal to ordain. In reply to Bishop Griswold's letter, he received from Bishop Hobart "a long, particular, and very friendly answer." All this correspondence was laid by Bishop Griswold before the Standing Committee of Rhode Island, and that body "consisting of eight respectable and judicious members," all met in council on this difficult and interesting question, and gave it (says Bishop Griswold, whom we here quote,) "a faithful examination." The committee did not think there were sufficient grounds to prevent their recommendation of him for admission *as a candidate*, and they recommended him accordingly; seven out of the eight members of the committee signed his testimonials, and the Bishop received him as a candidate, notwithstanding Bishop Hobart's refusal in New York.

The case was one involving a practical question of so much importance, that it was much discussed; and as the General Convention met not long after its occurrence, the opinion of the House of Bishops was informally requested with reference to this case. Bishop Griswold was present, and after hearing what was said by his brother bishops on the subject, was rather confirmed, as he states, in the view which he had taken of the case.

The opinions on each side, seem to have been respectively as follows:—In opposition to the reception by one bishop of a candidate who had been rejected by another, it was said that it violated the comity which should exist between brother bishops of the same church; and such reception seemed to reflect upon the rejecting bishop as having been guilty of unreasonable severity and tyranny; that it was in fact sitting in judgment upon his official conduct without affording him the benefit of a full trial; and that it would seem to be useless for the canon to require, as it did, that a rejecting bishop should give notice to all his brethren of an act of rejection on his part, if any of them were at liberty immediately to receive the candidate.

On the other hand it was said, that there certainly was no express canonical prohibition, whereby a bishop was prevented from receiving as a candidate, one who had been refused in another diocese; and as each bishop had a duty conscientiously to perform, in this matter of receiving candidates, his liberty was not to be judged of another man's conscience. That if exclusion by one bishop was to be conclusive against the candidate, it made that one bishop, *quoad hoc*, dictator to the rest of his brethren, and legalized in some degree the interference of one bishop with the diocesan affairs of another jurisdiction. That to receive in one diocese a man who had been refused in another, did not necessarily imply censure or disapprobation of the bishop who had rejected him, for (moral and religious character being unassailed,) there might be reasons for refusing in one diocese, which would not be of equal weight in another. That a very important distinction obtained between the case of one who applied to be received *as a candidate*, and thus if successful, was put upon probation; and one who applied *for orders*, upon his candidateship in another diocese, after having been there refused. In the latter case, it would no doubt be proper to refuse him orders, until he had been subjected to observation and scrutiny by being a candidate. That as to the notice required by the canon from a bishop who rejected, to his brother bishops, its purpose was not to settle the question, but to put them on their guard, to induce inquiry on their parts, of the rejecting bishop into the causes why the candidate should not be received; to make them more than usually scrupulous in investigating the character of the applicant, and finally, to ensure the rejection of a plausible but bad man, who going to a distant diocese might impose upon the ignorance of the bishop. That to let each case be judged upon its own merits, best sustained the great principles, of the perfect equality of our bishops, was attended with little or no danger, as all the bishops had a common object in keeping out bad men, and that in the very few cases in which differences of opinion would at last exist, no censure would be implied, for it would be but the common instance of one court judging differently from another, upon the same state of facts. And even admitting it to be censure, it was said to be better to inflict censure upon a bishop who deserved it, than to perpetuate injustice to uphold his dignity.

It was also said to be a great hardship and an invasion of the fair rights of a man, to refuse him absolutely all possibility of obtaining orders, upon the partial decision of one bishop, who might be the unworthy slave of prejudice or resentment; when had he applied to any other one of the fifteen or twenty who might be in the Church, he would have found no difficulty: that in such cases a man ought to be allowed to appeal to an unprejudiced bishop for a fair decision on his merits,*

In this case, after having been a candidate for some time under Bishop Griswold, the candidate was ordained by him.

It would seem that there was a preponderance of opinion in the Church, in favor of the course pursued by Bishop Griswold, for though, as we have stated, the subject came informally before the House of Bishops for their opinion, yet no legislation took place which was thereafter to prevent the bishops from pursuing such a course as Bishop Griswold had taken. It is not hard to suppose that each bishop felt that his personal and official independence of action might be compromised by any legislation on the subject, and it was therefore thought best to leave it as it stood, trusting to the mutual good understanding of the bishops, and to their having a common interest in the exclusion of the unworthy, to prevent all probable evils.

In conclusion, it should be remarked that Bishop Griswold expressed himself as being fully aware of the importance of this case as establishing a *precedent;* and therefore he bestowed upon it no trifling attention. So far as it is a precedent, the canon of 1832 sustains it, for it does not introduce any prohibition.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

* Se Bp. Griswold's addresses to the Eastern Diocese for 1823—1824.

Education.

REMARKS ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

NUMBER TWO.

If there be any exception taken to the remarks in my last number, defining the true import of education, it will probably be to the position which implies, that in all our systems of education, at home, or at school, provision should be made for the most ample *religious* culture of the pupils.

Before proceeding to other topics, therefore, suggested by the idea of education, which makes it embrace the culture of the whole man, I will offer some remarks upon that department, which, though it be the only sure foundation for anything valuable in the character of individuals, or communities, is the least regarded. This will open to us a field of discussion, that has not, as yet, been much prëoccupied, though, in my view, the most important that can be entered upon. It will lead us into an examination of the system of instruction as it now is throughout the country, and to the important inquiry, whether, notwithstanding the loud praises that are daily sung to our plans of education, and the prevailing knowledge of our times, there be not much of doubtful tendency, and much of real harm;—whether in the calculations of those who hope to find, in the extension of our present school system, a panacea for all our woes, moral, political, and social, there be not left out the only SANATIVE ELEMENT, the absence of which must vitiate the entire result.

There are those, nominally *christian* too, who object to early religious instruction, on the ground that it forestals the judgment, and prëoccupies the mind with dogmas not received on evidence, and so unfits it for investigation of religious truth at a later date; or disposes it, when it does come to maturity of reason, in obedience to a well-known law of our minds, in its attempts to cast off what it now deems religious error, to go to the other extreme and deny all religious truth.

To such I would say in the first place;—that *children*, must, from the nature of the case, receive instruction *on authority*. This is true not only of religious instruction, but of all matters necessary for their bodies', as well as their soul's health. And the idea that children must be made to understand the ground and reason of whatsoever they are required to do, or to learn is altogether preposterous. Children should be treated as children. And the teachings of the parent should be to them, what the teachings of our Heavenly Father are to the parent—a *law*, and not the less binding, because the *reasons* for it may not at present be understood.

If the minds of children are to be left devoid of religious instruction, until they are matured enough to understand the grounds of religious belief, we

may be pretty sure of their being subjected to another kind of influence that will afford an ample field of labor for the educator, when the time deemed fit for religious culture has arrived. Thelwall was of this opinion in regard to giving religious instruction. "I showed him my garden," says Coleridge, "and told him it was my botanical garden." "How so," said he, "for it is covered with weeds?" "O!" I replied, "*that* is because it has not yet come to its age of discretion and choice. The weeds you see, have taken the liberty to grow, and I thought it unfair in me to prejudice the soil towards roses and strawberries."

John Newton's method of defeating error, was by establishing truth. "An individual," says he, proposes to fill a bushel with *tares*: now if I can first fill it with *wheat*, I defy his attempts." And he who waits for riper age before giving religious instruction, is like the potter who should wait for his clay to grow hard and unyielding before he attempts to give form to the vase.

In the second place, I would say, in reply to this objection, that children can *feel* what they cannot understand. The great truths of religion exert a healing and enlightening influence where those truths are imperfectly understood, or not understood at all. The flower that wilts and droops in the shade, will lift up its head in beauty as the gentle influence of sun-light steals in upon its opening petals. But that flower which so revives under the influence, knows nothing of the laws of light. So, in the spring-time of life, let the young buds and blossoms, and the opening flowers of youth, experience the influence of God's word, the entrance whereof giveth life; and they will grow up like olive plants around our tables, fragrant and comely.

In the *third* place, I would remark, this matter is not left to our own discretion. The Most High has laid his injunction upon us. And with all who acknowledge his authority, there can be no question of expediency when it is ascertained. This great duty of early religious instruction is clearly enough inferred from the character of the Church of God. But it is specially and essentially included in the ordinances appointed by her Divine Head, and in the direct and solemn commands that pervade her whole statute-book. Hence, in the ancient church, her children, while yet infants, were recognized and sealed as members; and were carried up at an early age to the great feasts at Jerusalem; and, that they might be taught to take an interest in all that pertained to the people of God—the command of Jehovah was —(Deut. vi. 6, 7.) *These words shall be in thy heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou liest down, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou risest up.*" The Old Testament is full of similar commands and directions. See Gen. xviii. 19. Ch. xi. 18, 19. Prov. xxii. 6. Isa. xxxviii. 19.

When the New Testament economy was introduced, with its increasing light and spirituality, came the same duty enforced with increased emphasis; and parents were enjoined to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

But the most formidable objections to be met, are those that refer to religious instruction in our *schools;* formidable because they come from higher sources, and because there is in most of our schools and colleges, a decided practical rejection of religious influence, and for reasons, as we expect to show, that make it at least *expedient* for those concerned in their management, to tolerate if not to justify.

In the early history of this country, particularly of New-England, the first provisions made for themselves, as a community, were the means of education. Massachusetts, as early as 1647, passed an act requiring every town, "after the Lord had increased them to fifty house-holders, to appoint one within their town to teach all such children as shall resort to him to read and write." In every town the school-house rose together with the church; placed too in significant proximity, the former being under the very 'droppings of the sanctuary,' and designed to be of the church, at once, both nurse and child. Nearly all our seminaries, from the primary school to the university, had their origin with christian men—came into existence under the quickening influence of religious principle—were under the control of christian men, and founded, as their records testify, for the "promotion of *religion and learning;*"—they their originators,—rightly judging that *religion* was the most important element in education, and as necessary to make good citizens, as it was to make good men.*

Our schools and colleges, thus originating, still bear in some of their features, certain unequivocal marks of their origin and design: especially in this, that the teachers and professors are, for the most part, men professing the faith of Christ.

The presidents and professors, in almost all our colleges, are *clergymen.* But what is the condition of our primary schools and colleges, at the present moment, as it respects the provision for religious instruction? C. D. J.

* All the provisions for popular education in this country, probably had their origin with the Puritans. The following extract from the preamble to the first act of Massachusetts, respecting her schools, which I quote from the *Rev. B. O. Peer's* work on National Education, a work which I would most heartily commend to the notice of all the friends of religious learning—shows in what spirit and with what design they originated. "It being the chief project of Satan to keep men from the knowledge of the scriptures . . . the Lord assisting our endeavors—it is therefore ordered," etc.

Practical Christianity.

EXCERPTA.

Our extracts to-day are from Bishop Hall.

OF THE FAITHFUL MAN.

His eyes haue no other obiects, but absent and inuisible; which they see so clearely, as that to them sense is blinde: that which is present they see not: if I may not rather say, that what is past or future is present to them. Herein he exceeds all others, that to him nothing is impossible, nothing difficult, whether to beare, or vndertake. Hee walkes euery day with his Maker, and talkes with him familiarly, and liues euer in heauen, and sees all earthly things beneath him: when he goes in, to conuerse with God, he weares not his owne cloathes, but takes them still out of the rich Wardrobe of his Redeemer, and then dare boldly prease in and challenge a blessing. The celestial spirits doe not scorne his company, yea his seruice. He deales in these worldly affairs as a stranger, and hath his heart euer at home: without a written warrant he dare doe nothing, and with it any thing. His warre is perpetuall, without truce, without intermission; and his victorie certaine: hee meets with the infernall powers, and tramples them vnder feet. The shield that he euer beares before him, can neither be missed nor pierced; if his hand be wounded, yet his heart is safe: he is often tripped, seldome foiled; and if sometimes foiled, neuer vanquished. He hath white hands, and a cleane soule, fit to lodge God in, all the roomes whereof are set apart for his Holinesse: Iniquitie hath oft called at the doore, and craued entertainment, but with a repulse: or if sinne of force will be his tenant, his Lord he cannot. His faults are few, and those he hath,, God will not see. He is allied so high, that he dare call God Father, his Sauiour Brother, heauen his patrimonie, and thinkes it no presumption to trust to the attendance of Angels. His vnderstanding is inlightened with the beames of diuine truth; God hath acquainted him with his will; and what hee knowes he dare confesse: there is not more loue in his heart, than libertie in his tongue. If torments stand betwixt him and Christ, if death, he contemns them; and if his owne parents lie in his way to God, his holy carelesnesse makes them his footsteps. His experiments haue drawne forth rules of confidence, which he dares oppose against all the feares of distrust: wherein hee thinkes it safe to charge God with what he hath done; with what hee hath promised. Examples are his proofes, and instances his demonstrations. What hath God giuen which he cannot giue? What have others suffered which he may not be enabled to endure? Is he threatened banishment? There hee sees the deare Euangelist in *Pathmos*, cutting in pieces? He sees *Esay* under the saw. Drowning? He sees *Ionas* diuing into the liuing gulfe. Burning! hee sees the three children in the hot walke of the furnace. Deuouring? he sees *Daniel* in the sealed denne amidst his terrible companions. Stoning? hee sees the first Martyr vnder his heape of many graue-stones. Heading? loe there the Baptists neck bleeding in *Herodias* platter. Hee emulates their paine, their strength, their glory. Hee wearies not himselfe with cares; for he knowes he liues not of his owne cost: not idely omitting means, but not vsing them with diffidence. In the midst of ill rumours and amazements, his countenance changeth not, for hee knowes both whom he hath trusted, and whither death can leade him. He is not so sure he shall die, as that he shall be restored; and out-faceth his death with his resurrection. Finally, hee is rich in workes, busie in obedience, cheerfull and vnmoued in expectation, better with euils, in common opinion miserable, but in true judgement more than a man.

THE WISE MAN.

There is nothing that he desires not to know, but most and first himselfe; and not so much his owne strength, as his weaknesses; neither is his knowledge reduced to discourse, but practice. Hee is a skilfull Logician, not by nature, so much as vse; his working minde doth nothing all his time but make syllogisms, and draw out conclusions; euery thing that he sees and heares serues for one of the premisses: with these hee cares first to informe himselfe, then to direct others. Both his eyes are neuer at once from home, but one keepes house while the other roues abroad for intelligence. In materiall and weighty points hee abides not his minde suspended in vncertainties; but hates doubting where he may, where he should be resolute: and first he makes sure worke for his soule; accounting it no safetie to bee vnsettled in the fore-knowledge of his finall estate. The best is first regarded; and vaine is that regard which endeth not in securitie. Euery care hath his iust order; neither is there any one either neglected or mis-placed. He is seldome ouerseene with

credulitie; for knowing the falsenesse of the world, he hath learn'd to trust himselfe alwayes; others so farre, as he may not be damaged by their disappointment. He seekes his quietnesse in secrecie, and is wont both to hide himselfe in retiredness, and his tongue in himselfe. He loues to be ghessed at, not knowne; and to see the world vnseen; and when he is forced into the light, shewes by his actions that his obscuritie was neither from affectation nor weaknesse. His purposes are neither so variable as may argue inconstancie; nor obstinately vnchangeable, but framed according to his after-wits, or the strength of new occasions. Hee is both an apt scholar and an excellent master; for both euery thing he sees informes him, and his minde enriched with plentifull observation can giue the best precepts. His free discourse runs backe to the ages past, and recouers euents out of memory, and then preuenteth Time in flying forward to future things; and comparing one with the other, can giue a verdict wellneere propheticall: wherein his coniectures are better than anothers iudgements. His passions are so many good seruants, which stand in a diligent attendance ready to be commanded by reason, by religion; and if at any time forgetting their duty, they be miscarried to rebell, he can first conceale their mutunie; then suppress it. In all his iust and worthy designs, he is neuer at a losse, but hath so proiected all his courses, that a second beginnes where the first failed; and fetcheth strength from that which succeeded not. There be wrongs which he will not see; neither doth he alwayes looke that way which he meaneth; nor take notice of his secret smarts, when they come from great ones. In good turnes, hee loues not to owe more than he must; in euill to owe and not to pay. Iust censures he deserues not, for he liues without the compasse of an aduersarie; vniust hee contemneth, and had rather suffer false infamie to die alone, then lay hands vpon it in an open violence. He confineth himselfe in the circle of his owne affaires, and lists not to thrust his finger into a needlesse fire. He stands like a center vnmoued, while the circumference of his estate is drawne aboue, beneath, about him. Finally, his wit hath cost him much: and hee can both keepe, and value, and imploy it. He is his owne Lawyer; the treasurie of knowledge, the oracle of counsell; blinde in no man's cause, best-sighted in his owne.

—

AN HONEST MAN.

He lookes not to what he might doe, but what he should. Iustice is his first guide, the second law of his actions is expedience. He had rather complaine than offend, and hates sinne more for the indignitie of it, than the danger: his simple uprightnesse workes in him that confidence, which oft times wrongs him, and giues aduantage to the subtle, when hee rather pitties their faithlesnesse, then repents of his credulitie: hee hath but one heart, and that lies open to sight: and were it not for discretion, he neuer thinkes ought whereof hee would auoid a witnesse: his word is his parchment, and his yea his oath, which he will not violate for feare, or for losse. The mishaps of following euents may cause him to blame his prouidence, can neuer cause him to eat his promisse: neither saith he *This I saw not;* but *This I said.* When hee is made his friend's Executor, he defrayes debts, payes legacies, and scorneth to gaine by orphans, or to ransacke graues; and therefore will be true to a dead friend, because he sees him not. All his dealings are square, and aboue the boord: he bewrayes the fault of what he selles, and restores the ouerseene gaine of a false reckoning. Hee esteemes a bribe venemous, though it come gilded ouer with the colour of gratuitie. His cheekes are neuer stained with the blushes of recantation; neither doth his tongue falter to make good a lie with the secret glosses of double or reserued senses; and when his name is traduced, his innocencie beares him out with courage: then, loe, he goes on the plaine way of truth, and will either triumph in his integritie, or suffer with it. His conscience ouer-rules his prouidence; as in all things good or ill, he respects the nature of the actions, not the sequell. If he see what he must doe, let God see what shall follow. Hee neuer loadeth himselfe with burdens above his strength, beyond his will; and once bound, what he can he will doe; neither doth hee will but what he can doe. His eare is the Sanctuary of his absent friends name, of his present friends secret; neither of them can mis-carry in his trust. He remembers the wrongs of his youth, and repays them with that vsurie which he himselfe would not take. He would rather want than borrow, and begge then not pay: his faire conditions are without dissembling; and he loues actions aboue words. Finally hee hates falsehood worse then death: he is a faithful client of truth; no mans enemie; and it is a question, Whether more another mans friend or his owne; and if there were no heauen, yet he would be virtuous.

—

If earth (that is prouided for mortalitie, and is possessed by the Makers enemies) haue so much pleasure in it, that Worldlings think it worth the account of their heauen: such a Sunne to enlighten it, such an heauen to wall it about, such sweet fruits and flowers to adorne it, such varietie of creatures, for the commodious vse of it: What must Heauen needs be, that is prouided for God himselfe, and his friends? How can it be lesse in worth, than God is aboue his creatures, and Gods friends better then his enemies? I will not onely be content, but desirous to be disolued.

—

It is commonly seene, that boldnes puts men forth before their time, before their abilitie. Wherein, we haue seene many, that, (like Lapwings, and Partriges) haue runne away with some part of their shell on their heads: whence it followes, that as they began boldly, so they proceede vnprofitably, and conclude not without shame. I would rather be haled by force of others to great duties, than rush vpon them vnbidden. It were better a man should want worke, then that great works should want a man answerable to their weight.

—

I have seldome seene much ostentation, and much learning, met together. The Sunne, rising and declining, makes long shadows, at mid-day when he is at highest, none at all. Besides that, skill when it is too much showne, loseth the grace: as fresh coloured wares, if they be often opened, lose their brightnes, and are soiled with much handling. I had rather applaude my selfe for having much, that I shew not; then that others should applaude me, for shewing more than I haue.

—

An ambitious man is the greatest enemy to himselfe of any in the world besides. For he still torments himselfe with hopes, and desires, and cares: which he might auoide, if he would remit of the height of his thoughts, and liue quietly. My onely ambition shall be, to rest in Gods fauour on earth, and to be a Saint in heauen.

I care not for any companion, but such as may teach me somewhat; or learne somewhat of me. Both these shall much pleasure me; (one as an Agent, the other as a Subject to worke vpon) neither know I, whether more. For though it be an excellent thing to learne; yet I learne but to teach others.

—

I will vse my friends, as *Moses* did his rodde. While it was a rodde, he held it familiarly in his hand: when once a Serpent, he ran away from it.

Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

NEW-YORK.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S APPOINTMENTS FOR THE ANNUAL CONFIRMATIONS IN NEW-YORK AND BROOKLYN.

Sexagesima Sunday, February 14, Church of the Nativity.

First Sunday in Lent, February 28, St. Paul's Chapel.

Third Sunday in Lent, March 14, St. John's Chapel.

Fifth Sunday in Lent, March 28, St. Bartholomew's Church.

Sunday next before Easter, April 4, St. Mark's Church.

Second Sunday after Easter, and Festival of St. Mark the Evangelist, April 25, St. Ann's Church, *Brooklyn.—Churchman.*

VIRGINIA.

Theological Seminary.—It is with great pleasure that we announce to the Diocese of Virginia, that the Trustees of our Theological Seminary and High School, have invited the Rev. Dr. Sparrow, of Kenyon College, Ohio, to a participation in the conduct of these most important institutions, and that Dr. Sparrow has accepted the invitation, expecting to enter upon his duties in the month of April.

When we consider how long, how faithfully, and how successfully, Dr. Sparrow has labored in the cause of religion and literature in the Diocese of Ohio, what wisdom he has gained by experience in the instruction and government of youth, how ably and acceptably he has filled s chair in the Theological Seminary of Ohio, we may truly congratulate ourselves on such an accession to the Church and its institutions in Virginia.—*Southern Churchman.*

OHIO.

Bishop M'Ilvaine has received from Patrick Murray, Esq., a gentleman of Great Britain, now in Ohio, the sum of $244,45, being a donation from a friend of his in Englsnd, in aid of the Domestic Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ohio. The Bishop has paid the money over to the Treasurer of the Missionary aud Education Committee of the Diocese.

In recording this disinterested act of christian munificence from a stranger, we cannot but commend to the prayers and to the zealous nursing care and liberal pecuniary aid of all within the limits of the Diocese, the cause of our own missions.

On Monday the 10th inst., Bishop M'Ilvaine confirmed seven persons in St. Paul's Church, (Rev. Mr. Halsey's,) Mt. Vernon.—*Western Ep. Observer.*

FOREIGN.—ENGLAND.

Plan of Union.—A pamphlet has just appeared in London, entitled Wesleyan Methodism considered in relation to the church, to which is subjoined, a plan for their union and more effective cooperation. By the Rev. Richard Hodgson, M. A.

The plan proposed is the creation of a *Wesleyan bishop*, who shall ordain the Wesleyan ministers presenting themselves at their annual conference; the nomination of this bishop to be vested in the

Conference, with a veto power in the Archbishop of Canterbury. This is deemed the only requisite concession on the part of the church in order to secure a more effective cooperation between the ranks of Wesleyanism and the Establishment. The writer mentions the name of a minister deservedly high in the Wesleyan body, who, we have no doubt, were the matter seriously contemplated by its Conference, would in all probability be elected by acclamation. This gentleman is the Rev. Dr. Bunting, whom Mr. Hodgson seems to think the Archbishop would specially delight to honor with the investiture of Episcopal powers. Most heartily do we wish success to whatever shall promote the realization of the Redeemer's prayer when he said, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

The following statistics of the Wesleyan Society may be interesting:—

"From the minutes of the last Conference, it appears, that the number of members in the Society was as follows:—Under the care of the British and Irish conferences, 428,729—namely in Great Britain, 323,178; in Ireland, 37,047; in foreign stations, 78,504; under the care of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Upper Canada (in 1840,) 16,354. The number of preachers, regular and supernumerary, was in Great Britain, 1,078; in Ireland (including assistant missionaries) 345; in Upper Canada, 127.—*Episcopal Recorder.*

CANADA.

The interest we take in the prosperity of our venerable mother, the Church of England, (whether we contemplate her in the parent land or in the vast colonial possessions of England) is such that we shall deem it a pleasant part of our duty to bring her on all proper occasions to the notice of our readers. Those among us who think an apology necessary for avowing a hearty love of the Church of England, must seek that apology at other hands than ours. We have none to make. We do love her and shall continue to love her, for not a chrisiian privilege we enjoy but reminds us of her, and we religiously believe that all Christendom at this day has cause to offer one united expression of thanks to God for the past and present existence of the Church of England. From our neighbor of Canada "The Church," we extract the following:—

TORONTO, Jan'y 20th, 1841.

To the Editor of the Church.

Sir,—Will you have the kindness to insert in the next number of your journal the following extract from a letter lately received from the Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. It is a noble instance of the munificence of that admirable institution, whose benevolent acts are known and felt in every part of the world, and cannot fail to call forth the warmest gratitude of the Church in this Province.

JOHN TORONTO.

EXTRACT.

"I beg leave to inform your lordship that the Standing Committee, taking into consideration the peculiar and distressing situation of the two Provinces during the last three years, have determined at once to relieve all the Diocesan and District Committees in those Provinces from their pecuniary obligations to the society, and thus to give them an opportunity of re-commencing their operations with zeal and vigor. The book accounts of the Diocesan and District Committees have, in pursuance of this resolution, been closed in the Society's Office; and the undermentioned arrears have been cancelled, viz:

		l.	*s.*	*d.*
Arrears from Quebec Diocesan Committee,		451	16	4
"	Montreal do	342	2	0
"	York do	589	12	7
"	Niagara District Committee	180	1	9
"	Cobourg do do	70	11	10
"	Kingston do do	76	10	9
"	Johnstown do do	57	19	1
		1768	15	1

"At the same time the Standing Committee resolved, that no supplies of books should in future be sent to any of the Diocesan or District Committees in the two Provinces, except upon the condition of pre-payment. It will be necessary, therefore, that in every future application from a Committee a bill of exchange should be enclosed of a sufficient amount to cover the charge for the books requested, as well as for all shipping expenses, insurance, &c. A similar resolution was adopted about two years ago, with regard to the Committees in the diocese of Nova Scotia. This plan had the entire concurrence of the bishop, and it has been found to give general satisfaction. It is hoped that the Bishop of Montreal will approve the plan, and there can be no doubt of its obtaining your lordship's approval."

NEW-BRUNSWICK.

Private advices from New-Brunswick corroborate the report that Dr. Jacobs, the President of King's College in that Province, is about to be consecrated to the new See: of his fitness for that high and important office, a long established reputation as a scholar and divine will not allow us to doubt, although in the regular gradation of promotion, we might have expected to see it filled by the exemplary archdeacon of the Province.—*The Church.*

Literary.

THE SERAPHIM, *and other poems. By Elizabeth B. Barrett, author of a translation of "Prometheus Bound," etc. London: Saunders & Otley.* 1838.

It is not at all to Miss Barrett's disadvantage, as it certainly is a presumption in favor of her poetry, that her name is not so hackneyed to the public ear as the names of most of the "poetesses" of the day. We do not remember ever to have seen Miss Barrett's name in the advertisements of magazine contributors, or any way identified with the popularity-seeking tricks of the time. With the exception of an article in the last number of "Arcturus" we are not aware of any American notice of her writings. Her merit is such as seeks the shade; her thoughts belong to the retirement of home, and oftener still to the deeper seclusion of the soul; to heart-felt piety in dim reveries and pious visions. There are thoughts in her writings that the broad sunshine of the day would light up with kindling beauty, there are others that would be as quickly dissipated into dew and air. An abstraction and elevation of thought mark those poems of the authoress which are written on familiar and purely domestic topics; she always sees the ideal in the actual, and her philosophy is of no mean cast. It is the philosophy of Christian sympathy in this world animated by faith in the next. This rivalry of sentiment between the love of the earth and thoughts of heaven is a characteristic beauty of these poems. It is purely natural, far above the cramped state of mind which professes to be ready for the enjoyment of all good in heaven while it cannot appreciate any on earth. A short extract from the poem of "Earth and her Praises" will illustrate the manner of thinking we allude to. It is the Christian's praise of the earth.

"Praised be the mosses soft
In thy patnways very oft;
And the thorns, which make us think
Of the thornless river-brink,
Where the heavenly tread!
Praised be thy sunny gleams,
And the storm, that worketh dreams
Of calm unfinished!
Praised be thy cheerful days,
And thy night—time's solemn need
When by household faggot's blaze,
In God's dear book we read,
No night shall be therein!
Praised be thy dwellings warm,
Where, to hear of pardoned sin,
Pauseth oft the merry din,—
Save the babe's upon the arm,
Who croweth,—learning his first mirth
And laughter from the crackling hearth!"

Miss Barrett, it is very evident, is not ashamed of her religion; she is willing to confess a love for so old-fashioned a book as the Bible, and looks for the best mode of thought and feeling to the New Testament. This is honorable and ingenuous, far different from the course of many professed writers of sentiment who no sooner get hold of an idea of benevolence, or are able to talk of a love of truth, for both of which they are in reality indebted to Christianity, but they must profess a new moral system of their own. We like morality; we honor the beautiful inventions of the human mind in the walks of literature, but we esteem them only when they serve the best and wisest system of philosophy—the Christian. To show how poetry and piety are blended in her heart we quote the following poem: it has a free, bold utterance, full of faith and knowledge, and speaks with the directness of one who sees the whole truth.

THE SLEEP.

"*He giveth His beloved sleep.*"
Psalm cxxvii, verse 2.

Of all the thoughts of God that are
Borne inward unto souls afar,
Along the Psalmists' music deep—
Now tell me if that any is,
For gift or grace, surpassing this—
"He giveth His beloved sleep?"

What would we give to our beloved?
The hero's heart, to be unmoved—
The poet's star-tuned harp, to sweep—
The senate's shout to patriot vows—
The monarch's crown, to light the brows?
"He giveth *His* beloved sleep."

What do we give to our beloved?
A little faith, all undisproved—
A little dust, to overcreep—
And bitter memories, to make
The whole earth blasted for our sake!
"He giveth *His* beloved sleep."

"Sleep soft, beloved!" we sometimes say,
But have no tune to charm away
Sad dreams that through the eyelids creep;
But never doleful dream again
Shall break the happy slumber, when
"He giveth *His* beloved sleep."

O earth, so full of dreary noises!
O men, with wailing in your voices!
O delved gold, the wailer's heap!
O strife, O curse, that o'er it fall!
God makes a silence through you all,
And giveth His beloved sleep!

His dews drop mutely on the hill;
His cloud above it saileth still,
Though on its slope men toil and reap!
More softly than the dew is shed,
Or cloud is floated overhead,
"He giveth His beloved sleep."

Yea! men may wonder while they scan
A living, thinking, feeling man,
In such a rest his heart to keep;
But angels say—and through the word
I ween their blessed smile is heard—
"He giveth His beloved sleep."

For me, my heart that erst did go
Most like a tir'd child at a show,
That sees through tears the jugglers leap,
Would now its wearied vision close,
Would child-like on *His* love repose,
Who giveth His beloved sleep!

And friends!—dear friends!—when it shall be
That this low breath is gone from me,
And round my bier ye come to weep—
Let me, most loving of you all,
Say, "Not a tear must o'er her fall"—
"He giveth His beloved sleep?"

The volume from which these poems are taken was published in London in 1828. We know very little more of the authoress than we learn from the title page, that she has translated Prometheus Bound, and, what may be gathered from the choral bursts of song in her poems, has been a close student of her author. The Quarterly Review thinks the influence of Æschylus has weakened her poetry by introducing into it a rapid enthusiasm and declamation, which sometimes outstrips the mind of the reader. This is, perhaps, true but much of the excellence of the poetess lies in this enthusiastic mode of philosophizing. The style often might be more compact; the thought is often injured by a vague expression, but there is always the poetic fire beneath the material of words fusing and pouring forth the bright, liquid ore. We have other writers of literal description who paint for us actual, every-day objects; after these Miss Barrett may be read with interest. She has her own grove on the Parnassian heights; shaded, reverential, religious—while other poets are travelling the highway. If she has fewer admirers who turn away from the beaten track, the few who listen to her poetry will love it and honor the authoress.

BAMPTON LECTURES *for* 1840. *An inquiry into the connected uses of the principal means of attaining christian truth: in eight sermons preached before the University of Oxford, by Edward Hawkins, D. D., Provost of Oriel College and Prebendary of Rochester.*

OUR readers doubtless have lately heard and read much of the Oxford "Tracts for the Times," and what is called "Oxford Theology;" and it may be that some have supposed every conspicuous member of that important seat of learning to be an advocate of all the statements and opinions set forth in the tracts. To such, (if such there be) we say that the volume before us will undeceive them. We have here a voice from Oxford that on some topics speaks other words than those of the tracts: it speaks them too, without passion and invective, in a tone of Christian moderation and calmness, with the soberness of argument, and the modesty of true learning. The words too, claim the more attention at our hands because they come from one who believes that on some points, the tract writers have spoken the truth; from one who spake too by authority before the whole university. As some of our readers may not know precisely what is meant by the Bampton lectures, we will here remark, that by the will of the Rev. Mr. Bampton, his estate was given in trust for the endowment at Oxford of eight "Divinity Lecture Sermons to be established forever" in the university. All the heads of the colleges make choice annually of an individual to preach the sermons in one of the churches of Oxford, and the preacher is called the Bampton Lecturer. The discourses are always published, and many admirable volumes, from names of note, have thus been given to the church.

Dr. Hawkins' subject is the connected use of the chief means given us by our Maker to attain Christian truth; and we will endeavor to condense his argument.

Objecting to the position advanced in the preface to No. 78 of the tracts, that "Catholicity is the only test of truth;" and not subscribing to the sentiments propounded in the same place, that "Scripture and tradition taken together, are the joint rule of faith;" he proceeds to his inquiry, and reasons thus.

Christian truth is matter of revelation from the Almighty: the canonical scriptures are the depository of Christian truth, and whatever questions may arise touching the sufficiency of these Scriptures, the extent of inspiration in their authors, the means and method of interpretation, private judgment, the authority of the church &c.; it must never be forgotten that above them all "the great truth of the majesty of Holy Scripture stands preëminent." In the language of the Church of England, (Article vi.) "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

Having thus guarded against the suspicion of a design to set up any other conclusive standard than the Bible, our author proceeds to the statement that some previous knowledge of Christian truth is necessary to make the scriptures of the New Testament intelligible and profitable; that the books thereof do not pretend to present the truth in a *systematic* form, but communicate many things indirectly, which may greatly confirm some truth of Christianity, previously known, but would never lead a man directly to the knowledge of that truth itself. He endeavors to sustain this view, by the fact that all the books of the New Testament were originally addressed to Christians who had previously been orally instructed in the faith, and this he supposes indicates the necessity of provision being made for the continuance of such oral instruction to the end of time; hence the establishment of the Christian Church, not merely as the depository of these books, but also to furnish the requisite supply of preliminary oral teaching. The Church of Christ, therefore, in the view of Dr. Hawkins, is as an instructer, a precedent to the scriptures of the New Testament: and by the church he does not here mean the body of the faithful, the Christian ministry, or a general council, or indeed (we use his words) "the church as speaking collectively, or speaking with authority. Let us derive the statement of a doctrine from parent, teacher, pastor, friend, it matters not from whom, it matters not whether it comes to us with or without any force of authority, still the unauthorative statement and the authorative proof are together sufficient. No matter in such a case how indirect the proof; as a proof it may be even stronger, because it is indirect, built upon mere implications and allusions; but the direct statement and the indirect proof together constitute that clearness of evidence, which we almost instinctively require in whatever professes to be truth of Revelation."

He distinguishes between the *statement* of a doctrine and the *proof* of it, and denies that they are necessarily to be sought for in the same document. That the Old Testament affords no "natural introduction" or "preliminary instruction for the New," he thinks he derives from an examination of several most important doctrines, such as the Atonement, &c.; the doctrines being in fact, a key to the correct understanding of the Jewish Scriptures.

Our author next proceeds to furnish an exemplification of his view of the combined use of the Scriptures and the Church, in an application of it to the doctrine of the Trinity: and here he distinctly declares, that gospel doctrines are to be "taught by the church, proved by the New Testament, illustrated and confirmed by the Old;" that "the teaching of the Church of Christ" is of great use and importance, not to say necessary, "*as an introduction to the truths of the Gospel.*" He also affirms that "it is a plain matter of fact" that from the days of the Apostles, every Christian has been thus introduced to every Christian doctrine, antecedently to the study of the scriptures. "For the most part," (thus he speaks,) "it is almost impossible that the Christian should have first discovered for himself in the scriptures any one of the great leading doctrines of christianity." All must have been first presented to his mind from some source or other of human uninspired instruction." Some, he says, may call this *tradition*, but he is very careful to add, that it is *unauthoritative*, and ever to be distinguished from that "tradition whose usurping or ambiguous claims have so frequently perplexed the Church of Christ." By tradition he means here "a constant stream of oral teaching" merely. As to its authority he writes thus:

> "Nay, and there are cases in which it may be entitled to no just authority. The truth may be first suggested to us, for example, by one to whom we owe no deference in respect of his age, wisdom, learning, character, office, or relation; or the statement of a doctrine may be derived to us from a Christian Society greatly and manifestly corrupt in doctrine and practice; or we cannot but know, perhaps, that different individuals or different Churches advance conflicting statements, and if we are utterly unable to hold the balance of contending authorities, it is to us as if either statement were presented to our minds altogether devoid of authority."

The process, then, by which this great doctrinal truth of the Trinity is to be reached, is through the following steps: first the inquirer is in some mode or other to hear a statement of the doctrine, and then go to the Scriptures for the proof of it. Thus he hears the truth and finds that it is almost universally received throughout Christendom, that such has been the case for centuries (so says our author) with but occasional individual exceptions. This creates a strong presumption in its favor. Some going beyond this presumption, says Dr. H., "may ascend higher toward the source, and trace the doctrine to primitive times." The doctrine is so important too, that it is not reasonable to suppose the great head of the Church would have permitted such an error, if it be one, to have prevailed in his Church to such an extent. With such views as these the supposed inquirer is in a proper state "*to approach the consideration of the proof of the doctrine;*" and then he would find it established in the Bible. Our author thus sums up:

> "But supposing such a faithful and pious study of Holy Writ, then after this manner by comparison of Scripture, with Scripture, and of the New Testament with the Old; weighing well the force and design not of mere words, but of passages taken together with their context, and illustrated by others, all equally proceeding from the same inspiration, may we hope, by Divine blessing, to attain the truth: yet not even thus, if we regard the truth as if it were now for the first time proposed, or ourselves as if we were the first to consult the word of God; but accepting from the Church gladly yet not blindly, modestly yet not implicitly, what God has enabled her to offer; that is to say, first the statement of the truth itself, and next a strong presumptive argument in its behalf. For not to accept these advantages with every other aid which our brethren and our fathers in the faith can bestow, what is it but to throw away blessings for which we are responsible, desert the advantageous position in which God has placed us, and worship independence at the hazard of truth?

Of this, more hereafter, we now proceed with our analysis.

His next position is that more is committed to the Church with respect to *ordinances* than to *doctrines*. A less amount of Scriptural proof superadded to universal practice is sufficient to establish the divine authority of institutions and ordinances; and this is exemplified in the case of the Lord's day, of Infant Baptism, and of Episcopacy. This, however furnishes no argument in favor of resting doctrines on *tradition*.

"For any thing *external* might be handed down by the Church from age to age with far greater safety and certainty than a simple doctrine. We sometimes hear, indeed, the selfsame word "Tradition" applied to the continual transmission of Christian doctrines and of the books of the sacred Canon; but we cannot fail to observe the broad distinction between the two cases; the manifest facility which doctrines so transmitted would offer to corruption, against which the books themselves, publicly read and seen, and possessed by various and opposite parties, are comparatively secure. Just so might an external ordinance, cognizable by our very senses, be committed to the safe-keeping of the Church; its constant existence might be easily traced upwards to primitive times; and a comparatively slight recognition of it in the inspired volumes might be all we should require."

Our author enters next upon the questions of "church authority and church privileges" and commences with a distinct disclaimer of such pretensions to authority as he believes to be erroneous, and modifies such as he thinks exaggerated. The authority of the church is spoken of in three different senses. These are, 1st, an authority of *order*; 2d, of *influence*, and 3d, an *absolute* authority founded on *infallibility*. As to the first, it amounts to little more in our author's view, than asserting an authority in the church as a society, to provide that all things shall be done "in order" by her members, and to settle the terms of church communion. As to the authority of influence, as it cannot pretend to immunity from error, it can "claim only *respect* and *deference*."

As to the absolute authority he thus plainly speaks:

"In the third sense of the expression, when it claims to be *Absolute*, not admitting of question, founded upon Infallibility asserted or implied, this it is which we must disallow, by what Church soever it may have been maintained, or for what Church soever it may now be claimed.

And, first, the clearest assertion of this claim is that put forth by the Roman branch of the Church of Christ, not indeed *as* a branch of the Universal Church, but as the Catholic Church itself. Nothing can be more simple and complete than the authority which she claims in matters of faith. It places obedience to the Church, to the *existing Church*, in lieu of all inquiry into truth, nay, it repudiates inquiry as in itself a crime. So the claim is stated by her popular writers; as, for example, in the instance of Transubstantiation, 'The unerring authority of the Church has declared it to be true, and injoined the belief of it;' and after such a decision, 'it is the part of an infidel rather than a Christian to ask, how can this be?'*

"So it is laid down by another popular writer. The one gate of entrance into the Catholic Church is absolute unconditional submission to the teaching of the Church.' This is styled 'the fundamental principle of Catholicity.' 'No one is, or can be, a Catholic, but by his entire submission to the authority of his Church."

"However guarded, therefore, the Church of Rome may be in some of her Authoritative Decrees and Symbols, it is impossible to doubt the sentiments of her members respecting the Infallibility, and consequent authority, of the Church, her "supreme;" nay, as a living writer has even dared to term it, her "divine authority" in matters of faith. But this portentous claim we repudiate altogether, not only as not proved, but even as incapable of proof.

* 'The Catholic Christian instructed, &c.' cited by Dr. Middleton, in the Preface to his Letter from Rome, p. lxxvii. (fourth edit.) See Dr. Hey's Lectures, book iv. art. xx. sect. i.

No presumptive arguments, from the supposed insufficiency of the Scriptures, from the advantage, expediency, the alleged necessity, of an Infallible Interpreter, can prove the *fact*, that such authority has been committed to the Church; nor, again, can that fact be proved by any arguments from the words of Scripture, so long as the meaning and application of the passages are themselves disputed, and the dispute can only be determined by that authority of the Church which is the very point in question.

Take all the prophetic descriptions of the Christian Church, and the promises of the Comforter, and of the perpetual support of our Lord, and the terms, how emphatic soever, in which He conveyed His commission to the Apostles and their successors in the Christian Ministry, and what is really established by them all? They prove an authority to teach, but not absolute authority: continued protection, not immunity from error; the Indefectibility of the Church, not her Infallibility."

Additional extracts and further remarks are unavoidably deferred. We shall resume the subject in our next.

Anthology.

LINES ON PRAYER.

Go when the morning shineth
Go when the moon is bright
Go when the eve declineth,
Go in the hush of night;
Go with pure mind and feeling,
Fling earthly thought away,
And in thy chamber kneeling,
Do thou in secret pray.

Remember all who love thee,
All who are loved by thee;
Pray too for those who hate thee,
If any such there be.
Then for thyself, in meekness,
A blessing humbly claim;
And link with each petition
Thy great Redeemer's name.

Or if 'tis e'er denied thee
In solitude to pray,
Should holy thoughts come o'er thee
When friends are round thy way.
Even then the silent breathing
Of thy spirit raised above,
Will reach His throne of glory,
Who is Mercy, Truth, and Love.

Oh! not a joy or blessing
With this can we compare,
The power that He hath given us
To pour our souls in prayer!
Whene'er thou pinest in sadness,
Before His footstool fall;
And remember in thy gladness
His grace who gave thee all,

Edinburgh Literary Journal.

A LONDON LYRIC.

(*Without.*)

The winds are bitter: the skies are wild;
From the roof comes plunging the drowning rain;
Without,—in tatters, the world's poor child
Sobbeth aloud her grief, her pain!
No one heareth her, no one heedeth her;
But Hunger, her friend, with his cold gaunt hand
Grasps her throat, whispering huskily,
"What dost *Thou* in a Christian land?"

(*Within.*)

The skies are wild, and the blast is cold;
Yet Riot and Luxury brawl *within*:
Slaves are waiting in crimson and gold,—
Waiting the nod of a child of sin.
The fire is cracking, wine is bubbling
Up in each glass to its beaded brim;
The jesters are laughing, the parasites quaffing
'Happiness,'—'honor,'—and all for *him*!

(*Without.*)

She who is slain 'neath the winter weather,—
Ah! she *once* had a village fame,
Listened to love on the moonlit heather,
Had gentleness—vanity—maiden shame:
Now her allies are the tempest howling,
Prodigal's curses,—self-disdain,—
Poverty—misery:—Well, no matter,
There is an end unto *every* pain!

The harlot's fame was her doom to-day,
Disdain,—despair;—by to-morrows light
The ragged boards and the pauper's pall;
And so she'll be given to dusty night.
Without a tear or a human sigh,
She's gone,—poor life and its 'fever' o'er.
So,—let her in calm oblivion lie:
While the world runs merrily as heretofore!

(*Within.*)

He who yon lordly feast enjoyeth,
He who doth rest on his couch of down,
He it was, who threw the forsaken
Under the feet of the trampling town:
Liar—betrayer—false as cruel,—
What is the doom for his dastard sin?
His peers, they scorn?—high dames, they shun him?
—Unbar yon palace, and gaze within.

There,—though his deeds are all trumpet sounded,
There upon silken seats recline
Maidens as fair as the summer morning,
Watching him rise from the sparkling wine,
Mothers all proffer their stainless daughters;
Men of high honor salute him 'friend;'
Skies! oh, where are your cleansing waters?
World! oh, where do thy wonders end?

BARRY CORNWALL.

Topics of the Times.

JOSE GASPAR RODRIGUEZ DE FRANCIA.

The recently announced death of De Francia, who for thirty years has been the ruler of Paraguay, makes the present a good opportunity to give our readers an abstract of his singular history. For reasons which will be seen in the course of the narrative, the materials to do this are rather scanty, but sufficient is known of him to mark him as one of the most remarkable men of this age, or of any other.

The "Dictatorate" of Paraguay is situate in the interior of South America, between the degrees of 50 and 58 South Latitude, and 54 and 59 West Longitude. It has an area of 90,000 square miles, and is bounded on the North and East by Brazil, and on the South and West by the Provinces which form, or have formed, the United Provinces, under the government of Buenos Ayres, or as they have been called, the Argentine Republic. Its chief city is Assumption, situated on the Paraguay, or Parana River, and contains about 12,000 inhabitants. The whole country has a population of between two and three hundred thousand.

The history of the little state of Paraguay, though it is a country seldom mentioned, is identified with some of the most important changes in the annals of the world. To events in Paraguay are to be traced the downfall of the powerful order of Jesuits, from the great temporal power which it once possessed. It is well known to all readers of history that the Jesuits had almost entire control of the early colonies sent from Catholic countries to the new world, and of missions sent to the Eastern continent. The representations of Marco Polo, respecting the kingdom of Cathay, sent Columbus to seek it by a Western passage; so that to the Jesuits and early Catholic missionaries we are, in fact, indebted for the discovery of the new world, by Columbus.

The Jesuits governed large tracts in the new world, by a system of theocracy, and upon occasion, could show their ability to wield the sword, and conduct armies, as well as the services of religion, and the civil rule of states. The members of the order established in Paraguay and Uraguay a native republic, which in 1753 contained 100,000 subjects, and was governed with consummate ability and skill. Spain, under whose nominal authority the republic was conducted, ceded a portion of it to Portugal. The Jesuits resisted by art and intrigue as long as possible; and perhaps for the very best reasons. As politicians we have no doubt they were right in their objections. Failing to avert the cession, they put themselves at the head of 14,000 native soldiers; and so successfully resisted the Portuguese authority, that the two nations, Spain and Portugal, were compelled to annul the treaty. Upon this followed the expulsion of the order of Jesus from Portugal, and afterward from

other nations. Thus was the little theocracy of Paraguay the point at which commenced the overthrow of the most powerful order of ecclesiastics that ever existed.

Paraguay in 1776 was made one of the provinces of the vice royalty of Buenos Ayres, and the Jesuits were expelled by the Spanish government, they having been nine years before expelled from Spain. It so remained until 1810, when a rebellion having taken place in Buenos Ayres, the "provisional government" of Buenos Ayres sent a force to depose the Spanish govornor. The inhabitants of Paraguay defended him, for the very purpose, it would seem, of deposing him themselves — for in 1811, they erected a provisional government, still acting under nominal submission to the crown of Spain.

At this epoch rose the star of Dr. Francia. His life and character show how circumstances may make the man, and disappoint all calculations of his future course in new circumstances, when such calculations are made on his early character. Dr. Francia was the son of a French emigrant. He was intended for the church, and pursued his preparatory studies in the institutions founded by the Jesuits at Assumption and Cordova. In the reign of the Jesuits, it had been their policy in Paraguay and Uraguay to exclude all foreigners, and in those institutions it was, that he learned, probably, the same policy, which afterward governed him. He went no farther in theology, however, than through the canon law, and that diverted his attention to jurisprudence, to which he turned his study.

He became a highly successful advocate, and was distinguished for generosity, disinterestedness, ability, and decision. He was chosen one of the cabildo, or municipal court or council of Assumption, and afterward alcalde, or municipal judge. No man was more popular and widely esteemed than Francia; and when, in 1811, the provisional government was erected, D. Fulgencio de Yegros was chosen President, and De Francia, Secretary. As he happened, however, to be the only man of any brains in the government, he soon became *the* government. If his colleagues disputed his wishes, he still insisted; and if they would not give way to him, he would retire into the country, protesting he would have nothing more to do with the administration of public affairs. As his colleagues could do nothing without him, he was of course always called back, and begged to take his own way.

In 1813, Dr. Francia induced his colleagues to call a second political convention. He wished a more acknowledged participation in public business, and as he was the only member of the convention versed in business and books, he easily arranged matters as he chose, and procured the choice of two consuls, himself and De Yegros, to manage the government, instead of the old form of a President. His next move was to persuade Yegros that the better way was for them to reign alternately, four months and four months, and by taking the first four months himself, he got eight of the year for which they were chosen. When Congress came together again, at the end of the Consular year, he brought Rollin's Ancient History forward, and offered it as a standard, for the names and character of the officers, and induced that body to make still another change, and establish a Dictatorship.

So little were Francia's real character and ambitious views suspected, that the Congress made no difficulty in making this change, and agreed to elect Yegros to the Dictatorship. This did not answer; and Francia by serving the sapient legislators in a way which can only be described by the euphonious term "humbugging," actually twice deterred the balloting; and in the meanwhile so set his creatures to work, that he was chosen Dictator for three years. Yegros, who had felt sure of election, kicked a little, but Francia managed to elude and quiet him, took possession of the old Spanish Government House, and busied himself so successfully in the three years, to lay a good foundation, that he was in 1817, without any difficulty chosen Dictator for life.

He had marked his enemies; and his first study was to watch them. He discovered their conspiracies, frustrated them, and executed some hundreds as an opening sacrifice to his reign. He had secured the attachment of a small army, of about 5000; with whom, and his spies, he put down every shadow of resistance. He concentred all the functions of state in himself, and made his word law. He cut off all communication with the neighboring countries, and from his position had none with countries off the continent. Until about ten years ago, no individual, native or foreign, was allowed to leave Paraguay, and the means and success with which he enforced this prohibition were truly wonderful. During the latter ten years of his reign, his policy has been more liberal; and he has uniformly favored the arts, industry, etc., among his people. One thing is certain; that though at his accession the noble families hated him; and though he broke down all aristocracy but himself, the one aristocrat in his dominions, the common people appear to have been attached to him.

His people consisted of Creoles seventh-tenths, Indians one-tenth, blacks, mixed and old Spaniards, one-fifth. Out of these he raised a militia of 20,000 with which he so successfully repelled the invasion of the Buenos Ayreans, when they sought to force him into their confederacy, that they were content to let him alone ever after; and he as uniformly repulsed attempts at peaceful intercourse, as he did demonstrations of warlike approach.

Among the instances of his detentions were two Swiss travellers, Rengger and Longchamps, whom he caught botanizing and mineralizing in his territories in 1819, and detained six years, till 1825. These gentlemen published afterward a narrative of their experience in his Dictatorship's dominions, which was republished in London, in 1830. His most illustrious prisoner was, however, the Chevalier Aime Bonpland, the associate traveller with Alexander Van Humbolt, Bonpland went, in 1818, to Buenos Ayres, as Professor of Natural History. In 1820, he undertook to follow up the river Arana, in Paraguay called the Paraguay. On the banks of this river, while still in the Buneos Ayrean limits, he founded a colony of Indians, for the culture of the herb used in South America as tea. This tea is called *matte*, it is used all over the continent, and is a staple of Paraguay. Like Mehemet Ali, Francia was personally interested in the trade of his dominions, and did not choose that Paraguay tea should be raised any where else, if he could help it.

So one fine morning, the Chevalier Bonpland found himself in difficulty. A detachment of 800 of the Dictator's troops destroyed his plantations, and carried him and a large number of his Indians prisoners to Paraguay. Francia made him at first, physician to a garrison, then employed him to survey roads, but did not release him until the poor botanist had been a prisoner nine years. The early friend of Bonpland, Humbolt, the British Minister, Canning, the British and French Consuls at Buenos Ayres, and the French government applied to Francia for the release of the unlucky naturalist, but it was not granted till 1831.

Of latter years other travellers have penetrated into the "enchanted commonwealth" with better success. They represent the Dictator as having been exceedingly plain and active in his habits. Usually unsocial, he could nevertheless try a practical joke. He helped himself *sans ceremonie* to one trader's stock—making such selections as he liked: and when the poor fellow requested payment, he found he had waked the wrong passenger, and was fain to pocket his loss.

To sum his character, he was no worse than most men would be in the possession of absolute power, and better than most. His crimes were steps of cruelty, necessary to confirm his usurpation. His public acts were for the good of his country, as he understood it; and he certainly deserves some credit, for the freedom of Paraguay from the anarchy which has unsettled other South American Republics. Naturally shrewd, he took advantage of the loyalty of the inhabitants, and professed to acknowledge Spain's authority till 1826, when the old stock had died off. Then he proclaimed Paraguay independent, and in 1827, Don Pedro of Brazil recognized the Dictatorate of Paragury. This was the only recognition he coveted, and, so far as we know, the only formal recognition he ever received. In a word he was an able despot; and we doubt whether any succeeding ruler will govern so quietly. We do not know to whom the succession falls; and have no idea that the integrity and independence of the Dictatorate will be continued.—*Evening Tatler.*

PAGANINI'S LATTER DAYS.

Toward the close of Paganini's life, when he was broken down by disease, and harrassed by worldly concerns, he was greatly altered in person, but his musical talent underwent no change, except, if possible, a change for the better. Those who heard him at his last concerts at Milan and Venice, confessed that they found him more original and diversified, fleshless skeleton as he was, than when they heard him at Paris or Vienna. At this period Paganini's soul alone remained unshaken, and up to the last moment, however great might be the weight of the physical ills beneath which he groaned, his mental faculties were clearer than even in the meridian of life. His frame was utterly prostrated—a spectacle of afflicting ruin. The loss of his teeth gave to the lower part of his face an expression twenty years older than the years which he really numbered. His eyes were still lustrous, but you could no longer recognise in his physiognomy that mirror wherein, at the prime of life, had gleamed the first reflections of the magic produced by his violin, returning on himself. Yet still there remained the energetic and impassioned artist, rich with the illumination of genius, and extracting with his bow, from a single string, every possible species of musical picture. His soul was constantly meditative within him, and from time to time the sardonic expression of his lips informed you that the artist was less passive than weary—weary through a disgust which he had conceived for the world, of which his soul abhorred the selfish apathy, and which he beheld, after the manner of most great artists, through the haze of imagination and the mists of passion.

He was also greatly changed from the time when he flung his money with a prodigal hand, at one moment to pleasure, at another to the poor, and spent the greater portion of his days in ardent and

exciting conversation upon all possible topics. These were his pursuits when he was in the meridian of his fame. When he was last seen in Paris nothing remained but a sickly, fantastical, easily moved, and irascible man. It is deeply to be regretted, that at this epoch, a bitter and depreciating spirit of social sarcasm and doubt in matters of religion, appeared to be almost the only feeling by which he was animated. Sardonic sneering, and mockery, were the uniform tendency of his mind, while he was governed by his ordinary character and habits. It is a sad thing to be obliged to record this of a genius like his, and it is impossible to say what made him so, if bad health be not accepted as a sufficient cause. He had become at the same time, hard and avaricious, refusing himself even the simplest indulgences, and clothing his person meanly while the large sums which he gained by his professional labors were remitted to Genoa, or transmitted into securities, which he is said to have always carried about his person. — *London Magazine.*

We trust we are not ungrateful to Heaven for its bounty in providing for us, sinners as we are, so many sources of undeserved enjoyment, and among them we by no means class music as the least. We in common with all the rest of the world would pay a just tribute to the wonderful genius of Paganini, and we find no fault with him for the public exercise of his extraordinary talents. He owed it to the world to exhibit them. But the world erred we think in its comparative estimate of their value ; not that there were better violinists, but that there were occupations far more useful and important, though less captivating to the senses, than that of the best violinist ; and of these the world took comparatively but little note. It hardly seems to be the fit occupation of an immortal being to spend life over a fiddle-string, even though we may feel that the fiddle-string has its appropriate place as a legitimate and innocent source of pleasure ; and of those who most covet posthumous fame, there is not perhaps one deserving of it, who, were he permitted to choose, would select for himself catgut immortality. But all musicians do not die like Paganini. One of our exchange papers (the Western Episcopal Observer,) gives us the following picture of

THE DYING MOZART.

Wolfgang Mozart, the great German composer, died at Vienna in 1791. There is something strikingly beautifully and touching in the circumstances of his death. 'His sweetest song was the last he sung,' the '*Requiem.*' He had been employed upon this exquisite piece for several weeks — his soul filled with inspirations of richest melody, and already claiming kindred with immortality. After giving it its last touch, and breathing into it that undying spirit of song which was to consecrate it through all time, as his 'cycnean strain,' he fell into a gentle and quiet slumber. At length the light footsteps of his daughter Emilie awoke him. 'Come hither,' said he, 'my Emilie — my task is done — the Requiem — *my* Requiem is finished.' 'Say not so, dear father,' said the gentle girl, interrupting him as tears stood in her eyes. 'You must be better — you look better, for even now your cheek has a glow upon it — I am sure we will nurse you well again — let me bring you something refreshing.' 'Do not deceive yourself, my love,' said the dying father, 'this wasted form can never be restored by human aid. From heaven's mercy alone do I look for aid, in this my dying hour. You spoke of refreshment, my Emilie — take these my last notes — sit down to my piano here — sing with them the hymn of your sainted mother — let me once more hear those tones which have been so long my solacement and delight.' Emilie obeyed ; and with a voice enriched with tenderest emotion, sung the following stanzas :

Spirit ! thy labor is o'er !
Thy term of probation is run,
Thy steps are now bound for the untrodden shore.
And the race of immortals begun.

Spirit ! look not on the strife
Or the pleasures of earth with regret, —
Pause not on the threshold of limitless life,
To mourn for the day that is set.

Spirit ! no fetters can bind,
No wicked have power to molest ;
There the weary, like thee, — the wretched shall find
A haven, a mansion of rest.

Spirit ! how bright is the road
For which thou art now on the wing !
Thy home it will be, with thy Saviour and God,
Their loud hallelujah to sing.

As she concluded, she dwelt for a moment upon the low melancholy notes of the piece, and then turning from the instrument, looked in silence for the approving smile of her father. It was the still passionless smile which the rapt and joyous spirit had left — with the seal of death upon those features.

THE JEWS.

FIRMAN OF THE SUBLIME PORTE.

No people of christendom or heathendom, with human hearts in them, will fail to rejoice that at length the persecuted Jews of Damascus and Rhodes, and of all the East, are under the protection of the following Firman, emblazoned with the sacred 'Homaioon' of the present Sultan, emanating with due pomp and circumstance from the Imperial Chancellerie at Constantinople, and proclaimed to the whole Israelitish nation of the East.—*Western Epis. Observer.*

IMPERIAL FIRMAN.

An ancient prejudice prevailed against the Jews. The ignorant believed that the Jews were accustomed to sacrifice a human being, to make use of his blood at their feast of the Passover.

In consequence of this opinion, the Jews of Damascus and Rhodes (who are the subjects of our empire) have been persecuted by other nations. The calumnies which have been uttered against the Jews, and the vexations to which they have been subjected, have at last reached the Imperial Throne.

But a short time has elapsed since some Jews, dwelling in the Isle of Rhodes, have been brought thence to Constantinople, where they have been tried and judged according to the new regulations, and their innocence of the accusations made against them fully proved. That, therefore, which justice and equity required has been done in their behalf.

Besides which, the religious books of the Hebrews have been examined by learned men, well versed in their theological literature, the result of which examination is, that it is found that the Jews are strongly prohibited, not only from using human blood, but even that of animals. It therefore follows, that the charges made against them and their religion are nothing but pure calumnies.

For this reason, and for the love we bear to our subjects, we cannot permit the Jewish nation (whose innocence of the crime alleged against them, is evident) to be vexed and tormented upon accusations which have not the least foundation in truth, but that, in conformity to the Hatti Scherif, which had been proclaimed at Gulhane, the Jewish nation shall possess the same advantages and enjoy the same privileges as are granted to the numerous other nations who submit to our authority.

The Jewish nation shall be protected and defended.

To accomplish this object we have given the most positive orders that the Jewish nation dwelling in all parts of our empire shall be perfectly protected as well as all other subjects of the Sublime Porte, and that no person shall molest them in any manner whatever, (except for a just cause,) neither in the free exercise of their religion, nor in that which concerns their safety and tranquility. In consequence, the present firman, which is ornamented at the head with our "Homaioon" (sign manual,) and emanates from our Imperial Chancellerie, has been delivered to the Israelitish nation.

Thus you the above named judge, when you know the contents of this firman, will endeavor to act with great care in the manner therein prescribed. And in order that nothing may be done in opposition to this firman at any time hereafter, you will register it in the archives of the tribunal ; you will afterwards deliver it up to the Israelitish nation : and you will take great care to execute our orders and this our sovereign will.

Given at Constantinople, the 12th Ramazan, 1256, (6th of November, 1840.)

Miscellaneous.

[CORRESPONDENCE OF THE RECORD.]

BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION.

From the strenuousness and inflexibility of St. Paul, in his dispute with Barnabas, and his almost judicial censure of Peter, for temporising to suit his ancient brethren, many have been induced to think him a man of iron temper. They forget that he was willing to encounter an anethema, is his kindred according to the flesh, might thereby gain a blessing ; (Rom. ix. 3.) and that he counted not his life, or any thing earthly, dear, so that by the sacrifice of them he might win souls. The tenderness and delicacy of his gratitude to the Church at Philippi, that remembered him, and sent Epaphroditus to him, with the memorials of their affection, ought forever to redeem him from the imputation of frigid sternness. But the object of these remarks is not so much to vindicate the temper of Paul, as to show why an unjust estimate of his temper has caused that to be laid to his charge, which is not affirmed of any other writer in the New Testament, viz. ; the uttering of a deliberate imprecation on an enemy. The passage supposed to contain this imprecation, is the well-known one in 2 Tim. iv. 14, "Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil : the Lord reward him according to his works."

Now, however unpleasant the first aspect of this language may be, it is no doubt a faithful exhibition of obedience to his own doctrine, as laid down in Rom. xii. 19, "Vengeance is mine : I will repay, saith the Lord." For it is not a prayer ; much less is it a malediction. A disposition like Paul's, could not easily pass from a prayer for vengeance, or a fearful curse, to such a real Christian petition as he pronounced in almost the next breath. Two verses only below, (2 Tim. iv. 16,) we find him saying, "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me : I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge." What then is the allusion to the coppersmith supposed to be ? Neither more nor less than the indulgence of the very opposite of revenge : the referring one's cause, under a sense of wrong, to God ; disclaiming all right to take justice into our own hands, and leaving retribution to Him, to whose sovereignty it

exclusively appertains. My idea of the passage will be seen in a moment, by throwing into it the little parenthesis, which filled it up in the Apostle's mind. Thus, Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord, (not I,) reward him according to his works. The emphasis which Paul gives to the word "Lord," shows clearly, that in using it he acted upon the old maxim, *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*, that the mention of the master's prerogative, was the virtual denial of the same prerogative to his servant. Thus understood, the allusion to his bitter foe, instead of being the pronunciation of a curse upon his head, becomes a most solemn and pious deference to the Power which only has the right to repay enmity—is tantamount to an abdication of all disposition to repay enmity, and leaving one's cause with entire submission, in the hands of "a faithful Creator." Instead therefore of suspecting or blaming Paul for his language, I can even admire him, when I see him, under the provocation of "much evil" abstaining from the slightest attempt at requital, and with perfect equanimity trusting his cause with the wisdom and the justice of "Him who is *invisible*."

It may be thought, however, after all, that such an interpretation as has now been given, is without the sanction of scripture analogy. If so, I would refer to David's language to Saul, in 1 Sam. xxiv. 12, "The Lord judge between me and thee; and the Lord avenge me of thee; but mine hand shall not be upon thee." Here we find another sacred writer, whose temper has often been suspected, from the imprecations in the Psalms, of the same harshnesss, which has been attributed to Paul's. But we see how David speaks when he alludes to vengeance for private and personal wrongs, and in his own behalf. It is not fair then, to conclude that the language which he uttered for wrongs done him in his public character, as a prominent and divinely appointed supporter and representative of revealed religion, (under inspiration too,) is to be taken as the prompting of his passion. Those who said of David there was no help for him in his God, (Ps. iii. 2,) were virtual revilers of the Almighty. So the taunting letter which Rabshakeh wrote to Hezekiah, was not considered so much an insult to him, as to the Power which had made him king over Judah. Thus did an inspired prophet answer it. "Whom hast thou reproached and blasphemed? And against whom hast thou exalted thy voice, and lifted up thine eyes on high? Even against the Holy One of Israel." (2 Kings, xix. 22.) Accordingly, language is used towards Rabshakeh, which no private indignity could justify: "The Virgin, the daughter of Zion, hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn." This language, which Israel would not have dared to use for an offence against himself, as an individual. No more would David have dared to speak, as he sometimes does in the Psalms, on his own account alone. The man who could spare the life of one who was hunting him down like a bloodhound—who could say of one whose counsel he knew, if followed, would entail on him and his, the bitterst of mortal woes, not 'let him be stricken down by a thunderbolt,' but only 'let his counsel be turned to foolishness,' such a man is not to have his words accounted as the out-breakings of malignity. T. W. C.

☞ We have received the communication of H, and would willingly publish it, were it divested of some few pasaages which appear to us to border on personalities. The passages alluded to are not necessary to sustain the *facts* stated by H, and if he thinks fit to remodel his communication, avoiding what might now be deemed personal, we will cheerfully publish it.

Library of the Record.

PAMPHLETS RECEIVED.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, *A Pastoral Letter to the Members and Friends of the Episcopal Church in the diocese of Tennessee, from the Right Rev. James Hervey Otey, D. D. Bishop of Tennessee: January*, 1841.

THE BREVITY OF HUMAN LIFE: *A sermon preached in St. Mary's Church, Newton, Lower Falls, Mass., on Thursday, December* 24, 1840, *at the funeral of Zibeon Hooker, an officer of the American Revolutionary Army, by Alfred L. Baury, Rector. Boston:* 1841.

Acknowledgements.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL EDUCATION AND MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, viz:

From Annual Subscribers, $48. From a Gentleman of St Thomas' Church, New-York, through the hands of the Rector, to be applied to the missionary branch, $120. Amount of Receipts, $168. C. N. S. ROWLAND,

Feb'y 1, 1841. *Treasurer, 55 Water st.*

YOUNG MEN'S AUXILIARY EDUCATION AND MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The Treasurer has received since his last acknowledgement—From St. Clements' Ch. Sunday School Miss. Fund, $20. Wm. H. Mott, $1. Mr. Livingston, 50 cts. John N. Taylor, $1. Francis Many, $1. J. W. Stewart, $1. A. Van Ingen, Jr., $4. H. H. Elliot, $10. G. N. Titus, $5. B. E. Staats, $3. Rev. A. Tenbroeck, $2. Rev. A. Smedes, $2. J. S. Aspinwall, $6. P. E. M'Donald, $2.

By Rev. C. H. Halsey, from John A. King, Jr., $5. By John Snowden, from R. B. M., $100. By A. T. Canfield, from Miss Carville, $1. A. T. Canfield, $1. By A. P. Smith, from M. Smith, $2. T. Underhill, $2. D. H. Griffith, $1. D. H. Hoit, $4. A. H. Haight, $1. By Wm. H. Hobart—Sundry subscriptions, $12. Total amount, 187 50. CHARLES TOMES, *Treasurer.*

Advertisements.

TWO LADIES, lately arrived from England, are desirous of employment as instructresses; they will teach French, the Piano forte, thorough bass, and drawing in various styles, with every other branch of a solid and genteel education.

They will be happy to attend schools in New-York or its neighborhood, or to give lessons either at the houses of their pupils, or at their own rooms.

The elder has been engaged in the Vice Chancellor's family at Oxford, and both are permitted to refer to the following gentlemen.

The Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk, New York; the Right Rev. Bishop Doane, New Jersey; Rev. William Berrian, D. D., New York; Rev. Manton Eastburn, D D.; Rev. Edward Y. Higbee; Rev. James Milnor, D. D.; Rev. Joseph H. Price; Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D.; Rev. Thomas H. Taylor, D. D.; Rev. Jonathan M. Wainright, D. D.; James B. Ellman, Esq.; John H Hicks, Esq.; John Smith Rogers, M. D.; Messrs. Bartlett and Welford, Astor House, and Messrs. Swords, Stanford, and Co., from whom further information may be obtained.

A drawing class will be formed twice a week at their residence, 469 Broadway. 113t.

JUBILEE COLLEGE.

THE preparatory department of this institution will be opened for the reception of students on the first day of January 1841.

The course of studies in the arts and sciences will be extensive and thorough; embracing the languages, mathematics, philosophy and belles-lettres.

All students will board with the teacher, and become for the time being members of his family—thus securing a constant and parental supervision.

TERMS.

The academical year will be divided into two sessions of twenty weeks each. Forty dollars per session will be charged for board and tuition.

Bed, bedding, and towels, in all cases must be furnished by the student.

Washing and lights furnished by the institution and charged at reasonable prices.

All books and stationery furnished by the institution; to meet which expense, as well as the contingencies of washing and lights, the sum of $10 will be required in advance.

No student will be received until the current expenses of the session are advanced, viz. $50.

By order of PHILANDER CHASE,
Bishop of Illinois.

Peoria Co., Jan. 16, 1841.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

☞ Mr. A. W. HACKLEY, our regularly authorized collector, is now engaged in presenting bills for collection to the subscribers of this paper in New-York and Brooklyn; in accordance with the terms of subscription.

PALMER'S HISTORY—*Price 75 cts.*

A Compendious Ecclesiastical History, from the earliest period to the present time. By the Rev. Wm. Palmer, M. A.; with a preface and notes, by an American editor. This valuable and interesting work which should be in the possession of every Episcopalian, is just published, by

J23tf SWORDS, STANFORD & CO.

CHILLINGWORTH'S WORKS.

THE new edition of Chillingworth, lately published in Philadelphia, by the Rev. R. Davis, may be had of the subscribers. Price $3 in cloth, and full bound, $3 50.

Also, a few copies of Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, with the History of the Council of Nice annexed, price $2 50.

J30 SWORDS, STANFORD & CO.

CHURCH AND PARLOUR ORGANS.

GEORGE JARDINE, ORGAN BUILDER, Anthony street, next door to Broad way, New-York, manufactures in the most superior manner, and at reasonable prices, all kinds of Organs, from the largest size to the smallest. Also church Organs with barrel movements in addition to the finger-keys, by which psalmody is performed in the first style of execution and by the simplest mechanical means. This class of Organs is particularly useful in country churches, where organists cannot be procured, and has long been in general use in the country churches throughout England. 21y.

BOARDING AND DAY SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES, 168 Duane street, opposite the Park.
REV. ALDERT SMEDES, RECTOR.

Terms $250 per annum for board and English tuition. The usual extra charges are made for the modern languages, music, and the other accomplishments.

The house occupied by this institution is spacious and convenient, and in an open and very pleasant situation. The school room, being in the rear of the main edifice, is perfectly retired, and is one of the largest and most cheerful in the city. Having convenient recitation rooms connected with it, it is admirably adapted for its purpose. The number of teachers employed in this school, is such as to secure for each pupil, a thorough and minute supervision.

The Rector having been driven from the public work of the ministry by a chronic affection, which does not, however, disqualify him for the duties of the recitation room, is sincerely desirous to render his labors in his present sphere subservient to the cause of that church, to which he feels himself to be no less devoted now, than when he was permitted to stand as one of the watchmen upon her walls. He trusts he may be encouraged and aided in this desire, by some share of the sympathy and support of the "household of faith," to which he belongs.

New York, November 2, 1840. Hf.

The Church Record.

THIS paper will be published and delivered to subscribers in New-York, regularly every Saturday.

THE terms of subscription are $3 00 per annum, payable in advance. No subscription received for a less term than six months. A notification to discontinue must be made at least one month previous to the expiration of the year. No subscription will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except at the option of the publisher.

ALL communications relating to the business department of the paper, must be addressed to the publisher, (post paid.)

ADVERTISEMENTS of booksellers and others, not inconsistent with the character of this publication, inserted at $1 per square, and fifty cents for each subsequent insertion. The price per annum, one square per week, will be $20, including a copy of the paper.

MESSRS. SWORDS, STANFORD & Co., No. 152 Broadway, are our agents in New-York, and will receive subscriptions and payments. Advertisements and communications left with them, will receive prompt attention.

LIST OF AGENTS.

Rev. A. H. PARTRIDGE, Bedford, Westchester Co., N. Y.
WEEKS, JORDAN & Co., 121 Washington st., Boston, Ms.
D. BRUNNER, Bookseller, Baltimore, Md.
Rev. H. DYER, Pittsburg, Pa

PRINTED AT
ST. THOMAS' HALL PRESS:
BY CHARLES R. LINCOLN.

☞ All descriptions of Letter-Press Printing neatly and accurately executed at the office of the Church Record. Orders are respectfully solicited.

☞ The arrangements are such as enables the Press to execute with accuracy and neatness, all descriptions of Mathematical Printing, Greek, Hebrew (with or without the vowel points,) and works in other Oriental and Modern Languages. Publishers will be accommodated on the most favorable terms.